

1 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
2 Jon V. Swenson (SBN 233054)
3 1001 Page Mill Road
Building One, Suite 200
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1007
Telephone: (650) 739-7500
Facsimile: (650) 739-7699
Email: jon.swenson@bakerbotts.com

5
6 BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
John M. Taladay (*pro hac vice*)
Joseph Ostoyich (*pro hac vice*)
Erik T. Koons (*pro hac vice*)
Charles M. Malaise (*pro hac vice*)
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2400
Telephone: (202) 639-7700
Facsimile: (202) 639-7890
Email: john.taladay@bakerbotts.com
Email: joseph.ostoyich@bakerbotts.com
Email: erik.koons@bakerbotts.com
Email: charles.malaise@bakerbotts.com

12
13 *Attorneys Specially Appearing for Defendants*
Philips Taiwan Limited and Philips do Brasil Ltda.

14
15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16
17 In re: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 07-5944 SC
MDL No. 1917

18 This Document Relates to:

19 **ALL INDIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS**

20
21 **DECLARATION OF ERIK T. KOONS IN**
 SUPPORT OF PHILIPS TAIWAN
 LIMITED'S AND PHILIPS DO BRASIL
 LTDA.'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR
 INSUFFICIENT SERVICE OF PROCESS
 AND LACK OF PERSONAL
 JURISDICTION

1 I, Erik T. Koons, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am a partner with the law firm of Baker Botts L.L.P., counsel for Defendants
3 Koninklijke Philips N.V. (“KPNV”) and Philips Electronics North America Corporation
4 (“PENAC”). I make this declaration in support of Philips Taiwan Limited’s (“PTL”) and Philips do
5 Brasil Ltda.’s (“PDBL”) Motion to Dismiss for Insufficient Service of Process and Lack of Personal
6 Jurisdiction.

7 2. Attached as Exhibit A to this declaration is a true and correct copy of PTL and
8 PDBL’s motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and insufficient service of process,
9 among other bases, that was filed on May 18, 2009, and related documents. This motion was
10 originally filed by Philips Electronics Industries (Taiwan), Ltd. and Philips da Amazonia Industria
11 Electronica Ltda., which have since been merged into PTL and PDBL, respectively. This
12 declaration will refer to these entities by their current names.

13 3. I was admitted to appear *pro hac vice* in this case on behalf of Defendants KPNV and
14 PENAC. *See* Dkt Nos. 1517, 1519. I have not appeared on behalf of PTL or PDBL in this action.

15 4. Attached as Exhibit B to this declaration is a true and correct copy of the May 24,
16 2010 letter from Ethan E. Litwin to Special Master Charles A. Legge, which was filed on May 25,
17 2010, at docket number 720.

18 5. On November 13, 2013, counsel for the Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs (“IPPs”)
19 contacted me to discuss PTL and PDBL’s May 18, 2009 motion to dismiss for lack of personal
20 jurisdiction and insufficient service of process.

21 6. On November 15, 2013, I participated in a telephonic meet-and-confer with counsel
22 for IPPs regarding the pending jurisdictional motion. During the conference, counsel for the IPPs
23 stated that they were considering whether they would continue to pursue claims against PTL and
24 PDBL, or simply dismiss these entities.

25 7. On February 5, 2014, counsel for the IPPs contacted me and asked if I would accept
26 service on behalf of PTL and PDBL. I informed counsel for the IPPs that I was not authorized to
27 accept service on behalf of PTL and PDBL and stated that the IPPs would need to serve these

defendants through formal and proper channels. IPPs' counsel stated that they would nonetheless serve me personally and consider subsequent service of process through the Hague Convention or other formal service of process.

8. In disregard of my instructions, the IPPs delivered a copy of the IPPs' Fourth Consolidated Amended Complaint ("Fourth Amended Complaint") and summons by certified mail dated February 18, 2014, stating in the cover letter that this mailing was to purportedly effect service on PTL and PDBL. This mailing was addressed to me and was delivered to my office in Washington, D.C.

9. Attached as Exhibit C to this declaration is the cover letter that accompanied the IPPs' February 18, 2014 mailing.

10. On March 4, 2014, I participated in a telephonic meet-and-confer with counsel for the IPPs during which I again informed IPP counsel that service of the Fourth Amended Complaint and summons was defective and thus ineffective. I again encouraged IPP counsel to formally serve PTL and PDBL through proper channels and inquired whether the IPPs intended to effectuate such formal service. Counsel for the IPPs stated that they had elected not to effect service through alternative, formal means.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed this 26th day of March, 2014, in Washington, D.C.

/s/ Erik T. Koons
Erik T. Koons